

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE PROCEDURES

A lecture given on
17 October 1961

How are you?

Audience: Okay. Fine.

Okay. This is the 17th of October 1961, and boy, are you in for it. I hate that sadistic look. Actually, one life I . . . whole life I spent as a pirate I've resented ever since and I take it out on bad auditing. Bad auditing restimulates this life of piracy. Because that's what it is; it's just butchery. And there's just no sense in it. There's no sense in bad auditing

To show you how bad it can get, when Saint Hillers go back for the first time into an area, the few who have left here, they've given demonstrations and they've found interesting things like this: The whole crowd they demonstrated to, all professional auditors, saw for the first time a null needle on an E-Meter. It's kind of a bitter criticism, isn't it. And the statement uniformly is made by somebody leaving here and going back to some area, "Well, Scientology has just never been done."

All right. You can dream up all sorts of fancy processes and you can find out what's wrong with the mind and you can search deeper into it and turn it all upside down, but if this never gets applied by the most elementary basics, what have you got left? You got wogs. That's all you got. Because nothing, no good, no wonderful process, no good and excellent analysis, no diagnosis, no expert textbook, seventeen libraries of tapes and all the rest of it are not going to make anybody well if Scientology is not applied.

Nothing is going to do it unless an auditor is going to do it. And there you have it. And an auditor has to do certain basic, definite things and he has to know these things very, very well. First and foremost of these things, he's got to get his TRs down, particularly TR 0. And then he's got to know what an E-Meter is all about. And then he's got to know what Model Session is all about. And then he's got to know how to Security Check.

Well, if he's gotten that far . . . if he's gotten that far, he's going to get results; and if he hasn't gotten that far, he isn't going to get any results. So this is the exact distance we're trying to pull up every auditor in the world just now. We're just trying to pull him up that exact distance. And that is a cornerstone on which we can build. That any results at all have been gotten around the world attest to my hopeful essays in ability, certainty, understanding, affinity and the other basics. Oh, that's a bitter statement, isn't it.

That's invalidative, but I've never invalidated before to this magnitude. But I keep getting these reports back from people who have left here. Now, I haven't really straight up, vis-a-vis trained anybody for a very long time. And now that I've started doing it again just here at Saint Hill, in spite of the fact that I don't sit there and hold your hand every session, I'm to a marked degree looking over your shoulder. And Mary Sue is looking down your throat.

Now, to be able to do a good assessment on Routine 3, and so forth, is like asking most of the auditors of the world to build the fifteenth floor of a building before they have any cornerstone in the place at all. Let's build the fifteenth floor and let's have it float. On what foundation? The foundation on which it floats is a tremendously accurate ability to do the TRs, an excellent command of E-Meter and E-Meter phenomenon, an excellent command of Model Session, and a horrendous ability to security check. Now, if you've got those things, then . . . then we'll have something on which to build. But without those things, we have nothing on which to build.

I know now why characters like Mathison could go on and sell 18-dial, 14-gauge, short-circuit-through-the-pc E-Meters. They were just window dressing Nobody thought they worked. And nobody thought they did anything. So, of course, you could sell anything

No, an E-Meter is a very precision instrument, and when you can make an E-Meter talk, you can make a pc talk. But you have to know how to make an E-Meter talk first.

Now, there are other methods that have been used in the past to make pcs talk, such as my career as a space pirate. I recall one incident vividly. I was part of another unit. I wasn't being a pirate that life. I play hooky every once in a while and go out and get active. I'm a great believer in activity.

I go between being very active and being very scholarly, and I'm afraid the . . . there are burn spots on most planets where I've sacked towns while being active or have prevented people from sacking towns; same final result, you see?

And alongside of that sort of staggered things to confound students in the libraries. Yes, I've been a perfect example of the Aristotelian Pendulum. Don't ever go in for any halfway measures. Either be very active or very scholarly. No, no, no middle ground, no middle grounds.

And in this particular incident, a space pirate came aboard this merchant ship, and in order to make them talk to find out the destination and where the gold was going to be picked up, took a crowbar and pried the spine out of one of the crew members. It sounds like a rather exaggerated activity, doesn't it? I thought it was exaggerated myself as we told him.

The Inquisition . . . the Inquisition used to warm people's toes at the stake and pack their chest and mouth area in ice so that they wouldn't burn and die too quickly. Well, that was after the fact they couldn't make them talk, don't you see? And if you'll find out, most torture comes and most punishment comes after all media to persuade communication to exist has failed. Brutality is after the fact of communication. Brutality follows failed communication. Overts are always to be found in the wake of no communication.

For instance, there's a ruddy alleged British vice-consul sitting in a town in Spain just now who is sitting on a couple of suitcases of ours. And what are we going to do about these suitcases? Well, he refuses to answer any communication of any kind whatsoever. We shamed him into giving us one letter by taking some pesetas we had and pinning them to a self-addressed airmail envelope and sending it down to him. And he wrote back some entheta. You know? It was some bad news he'd had from some other quarter but didn't mention these suitcases. See, all he's got to do is call up a steamship company, tell them to come over and get the suitcases and take them on the next boat, you see? Very simple. But he won't communicate.

Now what frame of mind do you think people get into after a while on something like that? I'm just showing you a tiny, little, present time piece of nonsense, you see?

Well, the immediate idea is to get the British consul at Vigo to go up and give him a good swift kick where it will do a lot of good, you see? Or write the foreign office and tell the fellow he's in league with the Russians, you know? Of course, he probably isn't too honest or he would dare say something. But he evidently doesn't dare talk.

Failed communication always carries in its wake punishment. It's why you get mad at a pc. There's something the pc won't say, and you can't seem to find the means to make him say it. He's sitting on some type of a withhold or a noncommunication or something of the sort and he just won't communicate.

The pc says, "Well, my mother beat me and she used to lock me in the closet every day and then she wouldn't give me any dinner. She never bought me any clothes, and very often threw me down the coal chute. Every time we went for a ride on a streetcar, she threw me under the wheels, and I was killed."

Along about this time you suspect there is some sort of a withhold about Mother. And you're tired of this violin solo because it's not by Stravinsky, and so you ask this fellow if he has a withhold from his mother or a withhold about his mother. And you get no response of any kind whatsoever.

"No, I was good to her. I was always good as gold, and I always smiled every time she threw me under the streetcar and killed me."

You say (depending upon your immediate antecedents) a word of a few letters. The auditor's ARC breaks down at this point.

Now, if all of this is true . . . that it's after communication fails that brutality begins . . . then any of an auditor's overts against a pc or any of his impatiences against a pc, must perforce arise by the auditor's own failure to make the pc sing . . . must so result. Doesn't that look fairly obvious to you?

Bad auditing follows failed auditing. You very often pick up somebody in a co-audit, you sit him down, have him just chatter repetitively some sort of a phrase at a pc, and the pc gets wonderful results, and everybody is happy.

Of course, the Instructor had to be there and everybody had to be there and somebody had to fix up the place and somebody had to put him in the chair and somebody had to hold the pc still. Well, beside that, there wasn't any failure involved and there's no brutality involved, and you'll find this (quote) auditor (unquote) loves the pc like a brother. And everything is going to happen for the best in this best of all possible worlds.

And then we put him on the Academy course and we fail to teach him how to run an E-Meter and we fail to teach him how to run Model Session and we fail to teach him any of the TRs and we fail to show him how you can make a pc talk. And he runs into his first pc or two, and they don't talk. So we've eventually got an auditor who is going chop, chop, chop, chop. And there is no "love thy neighbor" there anymore. Why?

The auditor did not learn the tools of his trade, so he instinctively falls back on tools of former trades.

Now, even the inquisitor, as he walked in in his blood-encrusted robe and said to the prisoner, "All is up, bud," in Spanish, German, French or hog Latin. He would still say, "Now, if you will just confess and say that. . ." I don't know. What god were they worshipping? Molech, Baal . . . no, no, that's . . . that's . . . I'm off the trail there. Some other planet. Anyway, whoever they happened to have dreamed up at the moment. "If you'll just confess that he is a trio consisting of Mama, Papa, Baby (or something like that). If you will just say this . . . if you'll just say this and give your soul and sin into the hands of, I don't know, the chief goat or something like this, why, we'll let you off. We'll let you off, and that will be it. We'll just execute you quietly or well let you go to prison, or something like this. We won't do anything very vicious to you." And that's all you've got to say.

Of course, the reason I'm gagging that up is because, of course, the same gag has happened over and over, religion after religion, planet after planet, trillennia after trillennia. It just happens to be in your history books that there's the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost.

Well, this is just modern parlance, and you'll notice it's gone up scale to a condition, see? It used to probably be the rock, the tree and the plow or something, you know? Probably more solid.

Now, let's look that over. He still is trying to make somebody talk, and when that fellow fails to do so, he takes him out, puts him in a red robe . . . or a yellow robe it was . . . puts "heretic" or something on his chest in Chinese characters, and puts him out there and ties him up to the stake, and puts some dry ice on his chest, if that's available from the local space opera club, and burns him. But he won't say it. He just won't say it.

That isn't a response of some cruel monster. The inquisitor is not a monster. He's just a failed thetan. He's just a living being He's got mixed up in some effort to make everything come out right in the social dynamics . . . he thinks. He's trying to do a job.

And the net result is that he does a brutal job because he has no methodology to get any information or to get anything figured out. He has no methodology. So therefore, an auditor who is not trained in the basics of Scientology is somebody who has no methodology. And you can absolutely count on the fact that as the decades march along, Scientology would go exactly the same route of the Spanish Inquisition. And any Central Organization or group of Scientologists anywhere in the world will move directly and immediately over into the same frame of mind with regard to pcs and the society and their job and

everything else, if they themselves do not know that they have basic tools that make people talk. It is so simple.

You do not pull an overt when you badly process a pc. That is not much of an overt. Yes, it makes you a knucklehead, and he's unhappy with it and all that sort of thing, but you have not killed all of his chances. His chances are not all up the spout. Maybe next year, maybe next life, he'll get processed, you see?

Maybe somebody will open the gates yet. No, the overt is bad dissemination because if you disseminate badly you head Scientology toward a brutality, and you make it impossible for this fellow next year or next life to have somebody open the gates.

Bad dissemination slams them shut and locks them forevermore. Now, the gates are well open at this particular stage, but they will not stay open unless the technologies of the application of Scientology are well practiced and well understood. That you can count on.

Now, I didn't mean that to turn into much of a sermon, but I'm dead in earnest about it.

Now, new students coming in here have a tendency to go on living at their same rate of speed. And we have introduced a new and shocking state of affairs. A person can audit, obviously, to the degree that he can command his tools. Certainly, that's true. The more I know about the mind, the more I know about my tools, the better I can audit, myself. So why shouldn't it follow true elsewhere?

There are about seventy-eight items on a student checksheet here. Seventy-eight items. If you passed one examination on one of those items every week, it would take you seventy-eight weeks. Oh, you aren't here that long. But if you passed one examination a day, one examination a day, you could probably make it. So that's what I want you to do. one examination passed . . . passed, not taken . . . passed per day.

"Oh," you say, "it's impossible." Well, you're in good company. Scientology is impossible. Nobody could have dreamed up Scientology; that's the impossibility. So if the impossibility is also nobody could learn it at that rate of speed, all right, so it's merely impossible. One exam per day. one bulletin per day. one tape per day. Whatever that checksheet item is. one per day. And you'll find your auditing skill will rise.

But it is fundamental that you have to get out of the road your TRs, your Model Session. That's very fundamental. Your E-Meter. Very fundamental. And how to security check. Because, listen, if you can't security check, you will never be able to make a pc talk. It isn't that security checking is looking for all the evils of his life, but how could you even find out if he has an ARC break if you can't security check.

After all, isn't it a Security Check situation? You're asking this fellow who doesn't want to talk, "Why are you not wanting to talk?" And find out whether he wants to or not want to because he's liable to sit there in some kind of a social chatter with you. And maybe you could look in your crystal ball or between his ears or be three feet back of his head and ascertain his exact state of vibration at this particular aura. Maybe you can do this. But it seems just a little bit odd that we should have to since I point out to you that people have also been able to do this for the last couple of hundred trillion years and we didn't have Scientology and we didn't have well people.

So don't buck against the E-Meter and its ability to pick up information because your inability to get information from the pc is what drives you down first into not asking for any information from the pc and then drives you into a vicious frame of mind about pcs, and then will drive you eventually into not wanting to audit any pcs at all.

Now, it's an oddity that the auditor who has withholds will not ask for withholds. So if an auditor has withholds and then on top of that can't get information from the pc and doesn't know how to go about getting information from the pc and doesn't know how to sort this out and can't make any sense out of what he is doing . . . he of course will wind up eventually not auditing, won't he?

And any auditor who at this instant is not auditing is not auditing because he didn't know his business, or at the time he was auditing, the business was not well enough understood. And he is not capable of using

direct tools. He has lost confidence that he can obtain the information necessary to resolve the case. He's lost his confidence in this.

Now, I'm looking at a couple of students right now that came down here because there is a Scientologist sick someplace, and they want to get the newest and best and go back and do something for this fellow.

Oh, yeah, but this fellow has had a lot of processing by this auditor and that auditor around about the place. Why hasn't he suddenly recovered? Because I tell you there's nothing wrong with him at all but he's got an area of withhold. And that's everything that is wrong with him. I could find it and knock it out in minutes. But so could any trained auditor who knows his tools.

There is no reason under the sun, no reason at all why Scientology should fail in anybody's hands at this stage, at this precise instant on its developmental track except if he doesn't know his business. Now, he could fail if he didn't know his business.

But you have just had placed in your hands a Problems Intensive. Oh, surely the form will be rewritten and will probably be rewritten again. It will probably be in the process of rewrite ten years from now, but it's a useful form just as it exists right now. And it will simply be rewritten and rewritten only to the degree that auditors goof with it. And the only reason it'll be rewritten is to add another line or something saying, "Do not ever assess Section A," you know? "Assess O." you know? Something like that. I'm shaking this Problems Intensive form down. I'm shaking the form down. We know exactly, exactly at this instant, what the stack-up is in current lifetime that puts a pc out of action.

One can go in on this with such accuracy as to practically stand anyone's hair on end. And a new person, dragged off the street and given a Problems Intensive, her hair will stand on end because we not only have the tools of how to get information, but we also have this other thing: we know exactly what information to get. Because the anatomy of the current lifetime's confusions, failures and upsets is clearly laid out before us.

It is one of these idiotic maps, once it is drawn, of how to get to the house next door. I mean, it's that simple a map. There is nothing very complicated about this map. Exactly how you follow the map depends once more upon these basic tools which I have enumerated.

There are tools secondary to these tools which you will find it very useful to have around, such as the Auditor's Code. Recently, a Central Organization got ahold of somebody who was an epileptic. Person didn't say they were an epileptic. Nobody spotted they were an epileptic. Nobody spotted the fact the person had been on drugs and had knocked it off the day before processing. You know, after a year or so on drugs, you all of a sudden don't take drugs. All of these goofs, you see? But if they had followed the Auditor's Code, they still would not have come to grief.

We have never had anybody go spinny . . oh, this person is all bailed out and is all straight or will be . . but we've never had anybody go spinny under processing unless they've had usually a change of auditors or they weren't eating or they weren't getting any sleep. Those are part of the Auditor's Code. I haven't actually seen a good example of this for years because people follow it very, very well usually.

And sure enough this pc, because she was off of sedation, was getting no sleep and, having been on sedation, was not hungry and wasn't eating. I don't know how the change of auditors set up, but it probably was all awry, too. And the person spun.

So it's a good thing to know the secondary tools of one's trade, such as the Auditor's Code. It is secondary, but it is a tool of the trade. And you can spin people if you don't know it.

There are a lot of people around, for instance, that invalidate like mad while saying, "Never invalidate a pc's data."

You know, they invalidate, and then you say, "Well, all right, you're invalidating"

And they say, "Oh, no, I'm not."

And you say, "What is invalidation?"

They misinterpreted what invalidation is. They don't know what invalidation is. They don't know what evaluation is, so they disobeyed points of the Auditor's Code, so the next step comes up. It's a good thing to understand the tools of the trade in addition to being able to use them. And understanding of those tools is quite valuable.

What is evaluation? What is invalidation?

I had an old-time auditor suddenly blink one day and say, "By George, I do evaluate." Had never realized it before. It was on questions, and this auditor was asking questions something on the order of "Do you still beat your wife?" They were unanswerable questions. The question could not, of course, be answered by the pc. So it was accusative. It accused the pc of beating his wife. That was of course evaluative, invalidative, all in one fell swoop.

No, I explained the pc had to have an out. The pc had to have an out. That is to say you can't say, "Do you still beat your wife?" You have to say, "Have you ever beaten your wife?" And he can still say no. Don't you see?

So you can actually write up security questions that are completely off base. "How long have you been a dope addict?" you ask the pc out of the blue. Just out of the blue, you see? He's just sitting there, you're running down the list, and you say, "How long have you been a dope addict?" There's no out. He can't say, "No, I've never been a dope addict," without going out of agreement with the auditor, and so forth. And that is both invalidative and evaluative . . . both things in one. The auditor is saying, in essence, "You're a dope addict," you see? And he's also invalidating the pc to the degree of saying "You mustn't answer this 'No.'" But it's more of an evaluation than otherwise.

So in writing up security questions and so forth, you have to know about such things as invalidation and evaluation, and more importantly, know what they are. What is invalidation? What is evaluation? What are these shuns that you must shun? But these are basically elementary tools.

All right. Now we front up to another one of these elementary tools when we front up to the form of a Problems Intensive. This form is one of the oldest forms of Scientology, oddly enough. This form was first dreamed up in Elizabeth, New Jersey, in 1950. Found out that auditors knew nothing about pcs that they were auditing, so therefore, it was an awfully good idea to find out something about the pc, so this basic form was written up, and that was it. And this is almost the form. The early form was very close to it. I think that earliest form was used to make up this form.

Now, where you have an early form that comes through, it must have had some usefulness. There must have been some use all the way through. Right? Something that lasts this long. Well, so therefore, knowing something about your pc is valuable. Knowing something about your pc is valuable.

You can get into all sorts of messes knowing nothing about a pc. Well, it's just like a Central Organization. They never bothered to ask the pc, "Miss, have you ever been sick?" You know? "Have you ever been well? Have you ever been sick?" "Have you ever been?" And went ahead and audited the pc without ever finding out any information about the pc. Adventurous activity. Fortunately, it only happens once in a long while, but there it is.

Now, that was what this form originally set up to cure. Just that; no more. And we found it of value to know where the secondaries on the case lay. That's why you have Mother's death and Father's death and other deaths.

That's why those deaths are there. Because they tell you the most fruitful source of secondaries.

Frankly, if you run any one of those points as an engram, if the pc is capable of running an engram, if you know how to run an engram, if that is the engram to run on the case . . . all of those things providing .

. you'll spill considerable grief charge. And you open up a lot of track. Very often around a death like that you just get a total close in.

All right. We go into these various things, these various sections. They are simply an effort to find out something about your pc. Now, of course, a pc will always answer questions of that character, and if those sections I've already covered with you in another lecture, an individual going on down the line will run into some of these things and rather be unwilling to give you the dope; and after that will be out of session on you and you will be in a perilous state of nowhere with the pc.

A great many pcs have secret illnesses. A great many pcs have had mental treatment of some kind or another. A great many pcs have compulsions and fears that they don't want you to find out about.

As long as you have a social mores built around "One must be social" in some fashion . . there are actually thousands of such mores . . as long as you have those things, people will violate them. And when they violate them, they go out of communication with the group. And when they go out of communication with the group, then they're out of communication with groups. And an auditor-pc relationship is a group. So therefore, you've got to raise their group consciousness before you get an auditor-pc relationship. Auditor and pc form a group.

So therefore, some of these sections are pulled with an eye on the needle. You put your eye on the needle, and you get all there is to know on that particular thing. Not operations. Who cares? Who cares how many operations they've had.

You say, "How many operations have you had in your life?"

"Well," the fellow says, "I had tonsillectomy, and I had a tooth operation once, and I had a uh . . uh . . had a uh . . uh . . hernia and so forth."

Let's see if there are any more.

I say, "Good. Fine. Thank you. Now, what is your present physical condition?"

His operation denotes nothing You don't know who made up whose mind that who had to have an operation, you see? That is not the type of change or anything that you care to have much to do with at this particular angle because you can throw him into the incident. You can throw him right down into the incident. So it wouldn't do any good to plunge him into a series of engrams, would it? So there isn't any point in plunging him into engrams.

You take accidents, operations, dust it off lightly. Just very lightly. Skip it.

I know if you're from Iowa or something like that, you'll have to restrain yourself because that's the sole source of social conversation. But dust it off lightly.

And then we get into this thing: physical condition. What's wrong with the pc? What is wrong with the pc? Oh, well, the pc has a couple of social diseases. Oh. And if this is a withhold, it becomes a circuit. Ho-hoooo. And the pc will never answer an auditing command as long as you audit him. The auditing command is always addressed to something or other which is addressed to something or other which is scheduled to cure this thing he hasn't told you about.

All societies set themselves up to be ill. No society is any exception to that, because as soon as you get together a huge mores of thou-shalt-not's, you of course get the two phenomena of withhold and make guilty. And people will use them to make other people guilty. And people will withhold them and make other people withhold them. And it throws the people out of communication with the people and therefore you get no as-ising of those conditions and so all civilizations grow ill and die, whether they are Egyptian or Greek or Roman or British or American. They all become ill from their own mores because they bring with them the attendant phenomena of withholds and make-guilties. Whenever you have a mores as the sole method of being civilized, you will have decay and death.

Now, Scientology is the first track area that has ever been which could form a mores which did not result in destruction. But it can only do this if Scientologists know their business. It would inevitably sicken and die the moment that nobody could make anybody talk. Then they could only make people guilty.

You see, if you can't as-is sin and if you can't wipe away sin, then you can only repress sin. However you look at it, that is the only way civilizations have had of handling sin. "Thou shalt not kill." "Thou shalt not butter thy brother's wife." Didn't matter how idiotic or stupid or odd it was. The thou shalt-not's were their method of holding it all in line.

And they never noticed that to the degree that the thou-shalt-not's were enforced, the society sickened; the more punishment was administered to criminals, the more crime eventually took place. Direct ratio. Punishing criminals: just making people guilty of. After some criminal has been punished, of course, everybody else who was guilty of the crime is supposed to be restrained from committing it again because of the punishment. Well, it's a short-term activity; it's very short-term and it does have a workability. A very crude workability, but it does have a workability.

Now, someone could debate alongside of me on this subject . . some character back along the track or something like that who was fond of oratory could debate along this line and could prove to you absolutely and conclusively that civilization, any civilization, owed its becoming a civilization totally to the mechanism of making people guilty and making people withhold their crimes and sins. He could prove this conclusively as long as he was arguing from the basis that man is evil. If he was arguing from that basis, he could prove it conclusively. But remember to examine his premise. And his premise is "man is evil."

Now, you have to process somebody and find out that they are nicer people before you suddenly realize that "man is basically evil" is not a proper premise on which to base an argument. But man has uniformly used this premise and therefore has not thought any other method of civilization was possible. Obviously, if man is basically evil, what you have to do is punish man. That's the only thing that you could do with a man. If man was evil, you have to punish him. There couldn't be any other mechanism because if you freed him, he'd become more evil.

You will find that in trying to disseminate Scientology. You will find people horrified: "You mean actually erase this man's sexual repressions? Well, what is he going to do now about his sexual morality?" Oh, I think most sexual morality is based upon not getting any fun out of sex. Immorality is based on an anxiety to get fun out of sex or an anxiety to create a new generation. There's worry mixed up in all of these sexual abnormalities.

Somebody who can experience sex or doesn't have to, of course, would not then be immoral. But you get into all kinds of debates. And you can get into many philosophic debates about civilization, punishment, make guilty, evil, sin . . all of these things . . you can get into a lot of these debates. But you have to watch this one point: The premise on which the person is arguing . . is that demonstrated? Is the premise proven? And of course, you can knock all such arguments apart merely by pulling the rug out from underneath the premise. There's nothing sillier than a premise sitting on its "blank" on a bare floor.

Now, if you look over argumentation, you'll find you can always win the argument by pulling somebody's premises out from underneath him. But you've got lots of examples. You have demonstration which is quite interesting

A person is spreading entheta, chopping up, nattering, raising hell, leaving . . leading a very unhappy life and is actually committing sins which are recognizable sins of one character or another through life.

All right. You process this person; this person stops doing it and becomes more effective. All right. When you've watched that yourself and when you yourself have seen this with your own two eyes, then you will be able to conclude from your own experience that when you free man from his inhibitions, he becomes better. That you could prove positively. And then you could surmise, then, from that, that basically, if you let man's nature be demonstrated, and if you see his nature demonstrated and find it good, then you have to make up your mind that man is basically good, not basically evil.

This flies in the teeth of almost every Christian premise there is, by the way. you can get into some very, very nasty arguments on this subject because the concept of the original sin is the whole basis of Christianity. But I'm not leading you out into debates. I'm just showing you where this is and where it sits.

Oh, it's quite interesting. A preclear of whom you have some information . . . Quentin; he's a very, very little fellow; pint-size pc. He had five weeks of auditing at about thirty-five minutes a day, five days a week. Now, add it up, whatever it is. He's seven years old. Found his goal, found his terminal and ran his levels, and did a child Security Check.

That was what was done during that period of time. Needle is so loose now that the tone arm wobbles. He is very close to Clear. The next sprint of processing he will get, which is two or three months up the line, he will undoubtedly go Clear because he's proceeding that rapidly.

But it is quite amazing to have a polite little boy who is very active. This is one of the oddest combinations I have ever seen, you see? He's extremely polite and very active. He's now able to run about twice as fast as he could before and he can yell twice as loud. And he's about five times as polite. It's kind of fantastic. You wouldn't realize this when you saw him running around shouting, particularly, but if you had a conversation with him . . . even you . . . I think you'd find that he was very polite. Well, you see, that's just happened. He wasn't very polite before.

All right. Now, there's an example. There's an example. Now, what happened there exactly; what precisely happened? Actually, he became freer. He no longer has an odd feeling of being pushed around and being enturbulated. He described it to his mother, shaking his shoulders, as one of the results of his processing, that he no longer felt . . . just shook his shoulders and that . . . back and forth and grimaced, you see? He had no word to describe it. But that was evidently the way he had felt before.

Now, there's what we mean by freedom. Of course, you wouldn't think in seven years that a man could accumulate much crime. Well, it's very interesting the tininesses of the crimes, you know? Hit his sister, you know, little things. Made a big difference.

When you see that, you will see then the workability of this. The freeing of the person brings about a goodness. The person becomes more pleasant to others, and so forth. It's quite interesting. So that you can see to that degree a group restoring itself and you can see a vitality. You can see a greater motion, a greater action.

And where an individual has drawn out of earlier groups, they then become accordingly difficult to process in the group called auditor-pc and similarly hard to get along with in the group called Scientology. That's about all there is to it. If they've withdrawn, you see, to too great an extent from some recent group to which they have belonged, you'll get withholds, and so forth.

You try to make a psychologist into a Scientologist and . . . I mean a real, honest to God, dyed-in-the-wool, sat-in-class-for-six-years-and-learned-nothing psychologist. I beg your pardon. They did learn something. They learned the parts of the brain. I don't know what that had anything to do with it. I'm talking about a real, honest to goodness, supertrained psychologist.

All right. He comes over. you put him in the Academy. Oh, man, wow! We had one in Washington. And I think it took her three or four weeks to get through a Comm Course, and she was really trying. She was really trying. And everything it took a normal student a week or two to get over, she was taking five or six weeks to get through. Her rate of study was something on the order of about four times the amount of time consumed for the same absorbed datum. Slow!

She was not stupid. She simply was a renegade from a group. And nobody had run out the "renegadity," see? Because the person was now a failed group member, they didn't make a good group member, you see? And that mostly applies not to past groups, but it applies to more recent groups. That is to say it's most forceful right here in this lifetime.

You'll find it showing up in former lives and affecting the pc. Of course, that is the basis of it, but you will find out that you can't even get him in-session if he's messed up with groups in this lifetime. So if you get too much withdrawal from groups and so forth... So therefore, processing against the mores of groups is quite interesting. It . . well, it rather forecasts a Security Check for a college student, a Security Check for a high-school student, a Security Check for a basic student in earlier forms, a family Security Check, so on.

If you were to just take a Security Check for each group that the person had been part of and then gradually patched them up so that they actually could again be a member of that group, you'd all of a sudden find them going into session, bang! you see? They go into session very easily. Their rudiments would go out very slightly.

And some day you'll be picking up psychologists. After all, they had the goal of healing people before they got mixed up in black magic. And the psychiatrist similarly, the medical doctor, and so forth. Just remember that this fellow, when he moves over into Scientology, is a renegade. And as a renegade, of course, he has overts and withholds from the group he has just "renegaded." So you had better . . you better pay attention to that. It isn't what has he done to Scientology that is bothering him. It's what he has just done to medicine. That's what would get him in, you see?

No matter how idiotic this group sounds to you, it is worth investigating on the basis of a Security Check in order to get somebody in-session.

You know, it could have been the Girl Scouts or it could have been anything, you know? Suba-hooba-hooba. Well, they probably believed in it while they were doing it. Didn't get them anyplace; that's why they left it. But they're still a person who has been part of a mores, see, and certain things were guilty and certain things were make-guilty and certain things should . . had to be withheld, and so forth.

And frankly, you have to be quite clever to do some of these because you have to figure out what is the mores of the group they have departed from. For instance, what's the mores of a medical doctor? I don't think it has very much to do with social mores, but it certainly is a mores that is a mores. "Never give the patient an even break." I don't know if that's part of it. "Never sit down to dinner with your fellow doctors without discussing the gruesome points of the last operation so as to condition them."

"Have you ever failed to try to condition one of your fellow doctors so that he would be able to better practice his profession?" You'd get a knock on it.

Yeah, well, the fellow went to dinner one time and didn't bring up a single bloody operation. You know? It might be a breach of mores, you know? Well, what the mores of the group is, is what the mores of the group is.

And when you realize that there is no crime on the face of the Earth . . there is no crime on the face of the Earth . . that isn't somewhere else on the face of Earth a virtue. You'll realize that there's differences. There are pretty wild differences from group to group.

Now, when you start coming down this line, you will be able to spot groups that the person has been a part of. Present physical condition. Well, he said, "I was in the army and . . ." we don't care what else he says. He was in the army. Ooooh!

Now as you go through processing this case, you've got a lot of processing bait here. It says "army." Army. Right there under present physical condition. Well, of course, we picked up "army" someplace else probably, but we might not have, too.

Well, his present physical condition . . when he was in the army, he got pretty tired and actually was hospitalized for a while, but is better now. That's interesting That's interesting all by itself. Now, you're going to get it later over here on 0, but as you go down the line later on when you run this thing, and when you've run 0 two or three times and found the areas that you ought to get off the case, you would be very clever to go back over the whole form and find out if there are any more possible changes in there

that he gave you on the rest of the form that you are now beautifully missing on 0 and add them to 0. And just include them in your next assessments.

Well, his physical condition is much better now than when it was in the army. What army? What is the mores of an army? Later on you are going to have to realize that when you're cooking up a Security Check. He's going to mention a sergeant. Well, I don't know. What is proper mores for private soldiers about sergeants? It hasn't anything to do with obey the sergeant; be nice to the sergeant. It has nothing to do with that. He almost lost out in the whole military field. As a matter of fact, out at target practice, he never really used to be able to go up on the firing line with any degree of confidence. Why?

Well, he had a withhold from his other privates. He'd laughed at a sergeant's joke. It's all right to laugh at a captain's joke, but not a sergeant's.

There's various types of mores, Lord knows. And then it's of importance what army he was in. Zulu army would conduct itself quite differently. And in addition to that, you'd find out, I think, that the Algerian rebel army conducts itself quite differently.

I know the Chinese armies conducted themselves very differently. A withhold from a Chinese general would be something like he did engage in a battle once. That showed he was very decayed, and he's never told any other . . . anybody else about it. Or he thought of actually joining a battle. He thought of doing this. Of course, Chinese generals never do. What you do is maneuver. They used to in the old days . . . they used to maneuver until the enemy was at a disadvantage, and then the general who had the other fellow at the disadvantage then made bids for his rifles . . . for the men's rifles, and bought them at something on the order of ten maces per rifle or something like this. And that was the way the war ended.

In 1914-18, I think you would have found the soldiery involved in 1914-18 . . . I think you would have found them very, very pleasantly disposed toward that particular idea because the prevailing idea then was to take the generals of both sides, put them in an arena with clubs and let them fight it out. And you know, I don't know that at 14-18 it wouldn't have settled just as much. I don't know that it wouldn't have settled it much better.

You look back on wars, you know, after you've been in there pitching and trying to prevent this or save the world for Rooseveltism or something like this, you know? You look back on these things and you begin to, you know, say, "Well, I don't know. This is the way it is now, and we don't seem to have saved anything," you know? Usually can be depended on to give you a lose.

But mores depend on groups. And the more data you get such as interests and hobbies, his criminal record (group of a prison), compulsions, repressions, fears. These might tell you all sorts of groups of various kinds. You're getting future bait for putting together a Security Check, so you want to shake those things down with an E-Meter.

Furthermore, they could operate as a withhold from you. And in view of that fact, they could knock you out as a group, you see?

Now, as previous Scientology processing, you usually require four, five, six, eight, ten pages if you had it one by one and so forth. So we're not terribly interested in long dissertations on it. All we want is an estimate because we're not trying to run an ARC break here. We're not trying to patch up former processing. We just want to get some idea on how long this character has been around and more or less where has he been processed and how much just vaguely.

You're going to get all of that in the ARC break process anyhow, you see? Now, his present processing goes . . . we couldn't care less about that. But his life-turning points and so forth . . . oh. And now here's where I get into a frame of mind where I speak to you the way I have spoken to you early in this lecture, sadly, urgently, disappointedly. Look, nobody . . . nobody . . . could do this form wrong. It isn't possible. You have to try.

So let's go over the points which we have caught. And these points are simply these: List briefly. What is the word briefly? How do we list briefly? What does the word briefly means? Well, briefly, translated through ancient Anglo-Saxon means two words! No more.

Now, you'll find the pc assesses better if you move his time track around so you get the change. And then you move over in front of the change and put the date in front of it. And if you will make that change, you will find out your assessment has less trouble. Write the date, and then write the incident, the change, briefly: "1955, left Boeing" Totally adequate statement. "1947, tobacco." It's all shorthand. It means something to him. He either gave it up or took it up or something of the sort, but it means something to him. But if you said, "1947, tobacco," you see, this gets a proper registry. It doesn't mix it up with "1934, tobacco," when he smoked his first cigarette. Get the idea?

You'll find out your assessment goes more rapidly if the date is first. I've been studying what you've been doing and I've come up to these conclusions that you had better be doing it this way and this answers some of your problems. It's not an extraordinary solution. Your next forms that are issued on these things will be written up so that you can't do it any other way than this. you got that now?

All right. Date, then item. Date; item. Now, what is a change? What is a change? What change are we interested in? And don't let me catch you after this exact hour and minute on this particular time track ever listing again in the O Section: "graduated from high school." Don't. Don't ever write it down. Why not? Because it is not a self-determined change.

The fates called the school board decreed it years before that in 19-yumpf-de-yumpf he was going to be graduated from high school. And it gives you no forerunning change. It does not assess. It does not mean anything at all. In 1950, he certainly was going to graduate from high school in 1954. Right? When he went to the university, he certainly graduated from the university. So graduating from the university, from high school, anything else . . it is not a self-determined change.

Left the university in the third year . . oh, well, now, now, now we've got something here, you see? That's a self-determined change. You say, "How come you left?"

"Well, I just wasn't getting along well, and I decided. And I talked to my father and we decided and . . ."

Got it? That's a self-determined change. Understand?

Demobilized from army. Do not ever let me catch you soiling the end of a ball point with that one. Why? Men are demobilized from the army quite without any consultation. That is not a self-determined change of any kind whatsoever. The war is over or the enlistment is up or a time that is predestined and predetermined has now expired or the individual was foolish enough to stand up and bare his breast to the winds of the gunpowder and they couldn't use him anymore.

Well, what are you doing? What are you doing if you write that one down? Oh well, you're just setting it up to assess the times the pc has been a victim. And it will give you a totally different result. And I'm rather horrified to realize that I have to explain this because I will tell you this: that this whole thing can be thrown and its whole effectiveness can be knocked out and all of a Problems Intensive can be knocked in the head by listing other-determined changes.

If you list other-determined changes, what do you get? All you do is actually list Sections A to N all over again. And look, you already listed them. These are occurrences. O is a different kind of occurrence. And I should make this completely clear if you're ever going to make any. O is a different kind of occurrence. It is a self-determined occurrence.

He up and made up his mind, he did. For reasons best known to him and God that he was going to do something else with his life. That's what.

And that's what O is. O is not "Had an operation," "Was in an automobile accident and that made a big change in my life. Yes, yes. Well, there's the automobile accident. And you had better put that down. And then one day I was standing on the curb and a bus came by and the conductor hit me over the head

and that put me in the hospital. Yeah, that was a big change. That was a big change in my life. And then I graduated from school, and I didn't know what to do with myself. And that was a big change in life. That is for sure a big change in life."

Now, you get these things one after the other, and you assess being run over by a bus, being operated on, being graduated from school, and what do you have? You have a picture of a pawn being moved on the chessboard of life. And there it moves and there it moves and there it was taken by the knight. Oh, how sad.

"My career as a victim" is what you're liable to get under O if you don't know the facts of life. And the facts of life are these: What you are looking for . . . what you are looking for in the times when he made up his mind to change. Why? You're only looking for the solutions to problems. You're not looking for changes in life. He changed in life as the solution to a problem he didn't know he had. And you're never going to find the problems, and you're never going to find the prior confusions if you go ahead and list other-determined changes.

Well, how will you never do it? Well, of course, an operation will rock on the E-Meter. You give a complete list of operations . . . try it someday. Have somebody say, well . . . let's have somebody that was . . . really been hanging around the medicos, you know? There's only one part of one fingernail left of the original body. And here we are, you see, and you list this person's operations. And you say, "Did these make any changes in your life?"

"Oh, yes, made a big change in my life. Changed me from the house to the hospital, and then changed me over to the rest sanitarium. And then I got home. Yeah, that made a big change. And then from the house to the hospital and the rest sanitarium, and the house to the hospital to the rest sanatorium to the house to the hospital to the rest sanitarium . . ."

And you assess this. you assess this: "1956, had right foot amputated. 1957, had ear operated on for earisipulus. 1958, had torso annexed. 1959, had head amputated. 1960, toenails trimmed."

And you know what you're going to do? You're going to get some reactions on the needle. There will. There'll be reactions on the needle. Because you are listing a list of engrams. You don't want engrams.

You want times when he was walking straight up, apparently his own boss, and he said, "School, thou shalt not anymore house my sacred portals." And so he went, he did. Why?

He was going on a ship from Pernambuco to Liverpool, and it stopped in Bermuda, and although his ticket was paid, he got off. Why? You get the idea? The kind of change. He decided to go. He decided to do something.

And behind each one of these things, you will find a major problem in the hidden confusion. And that is the plot you are trying to solve. So why list anything else but the self-determined change. Have I made that abundantly clear?

All right. Now, in your problem, this is where you had quite a little bit of stumble. We are running Routine 3. Routine 3 selects out the terminal of the case. Now, some tests made recently indicate conclusively, and this changes something, because it's very rare actually I change anything in Scientology, but this changes something.

As long as you weren't running up against goals terminal, and you weren't pushing the person toward a goals terminal or anything like this, you could get away with running terminals, of course. But if you've got a person's goals terminal, you better not run any other terminal except with withholds and overts. O/W can be run on other terminals. You can security check Mama and all that sort of thing, but you sit down to a long grind of "What about that problem with your mother?" "What is unknown about that problem with Father?" It's this sort of thing.

It's Father, Father, Father, Father. Grind, grind, grind, grind. Repetitive process. Repetitive process. Repetitive process. And it toughens up the bank. Makes a present time problem too hard to solve. I'm giving you a new datum.

But when you . . . you can run terminals, and we used to do it, and it's quite well to do it, but when you have the goals terminal of the pc, it doesn't do him any good to run repetitive processes on any other terminal than the goals terminal. You can security check other terminals, you can talk about other terminals, you can move other terminals around, you can find them as parts of prior confusions, but you cannot run repetitive processes on them with any profit.

So you just up and takes whatever the pc gives you as the problem and you fit "unknown" into it in the simplest, possible fashion and you run it. And you find it'll do no damage whatsoever. As a matter of fact, it is better to do it that way than to run it with a terminal. Sounds strange. Sounds like a volte-vis, but I'm giving you the latest stuff.

Now, rudiments . . . don't ever assess for a terminal while doing your rudiments. A person says "I have a problem."

"Well, what . . . what problem do you have?"

"Well, I've got a present time problem." You finally isolate this present time problem. "And I'm having dizzy spells."

Obviously, the process is "What is unknown about dizzy spells?" As easy as that, you know? And the only mistakes you're going to make is get too complicated.

There's one other rule goes along with it. . . . You don't avoid terminals! Don't get that idea.

It's just . . . "Well, I just . . . what was my problem then? Well, I just thought I would go, gee, you know, how to keep from going mad living with my mother another day."

"Well, what is the problem there? Is it how to keep from going mad? The problem living with your mother, and so forth?"

And it finally works out to be "Living with my mother."

"Well, what is unknown about going mad living with your mother?"

Yeah, all right. But it is the most elementary statement you can make of the problem using the most of the pc's phrasing. You know, run the process he gave you.

Now, don't go over into a terminals run under the line of running a problem. "What is unknown about mother?" you see? Ahahaha. No, you're not running the problem. That is not what we want out of life at this stage of the game. We want this problem flattened.

Now, in view of the fact that you're not going to work on it for the next seventy-five hours, it's perfectly all right to run a significance. Oh, yeah, it'll run the pc's havingness down, but it'll only run it down to the degree that you've got the rudiments out.

Pc's havingness goes down to the degree the rudiments are out. That's a stable datum for you, by the way. If you find yourself having to remedy very much havingness for a pc, you know your rudiments are way out.

All right. Now, is there anything else to be known about this problem? Yes. Yes. One more thing that is quite interesting about problems.

Never run a stop. Avoid stills. Avoid stills.

I51 give you a problem that actually came up: “How to stop fighting,” came up on a pc’s report here. “How to stop fighting.”

What is the first consideration there? You say, “What is unknown about stopping fighting?” No. No. The better process is “What is unknown about fighting?” You know? Avoid those stills. Try to keep the still out of your . . . out of your terminals, your levels, and so forth. Get away from the still.

The Prehav Scale is a doingness scale. And you notice No Motion has now come out of it. So avoid the stills. Don’t avoid them in life particularly, but you’ll find out that in processing, oddly enough, is what it takes to make the thing move.

Well, how to stop smoking. “What is unknown about smoking” is your problem phrase. “I was worried stiff about staying home, and I thought I would have to stay home the rest of my life and there I would be and that is it.” And that is the pc’s problem.

Well, as the auditor, that’s your problem too. How are you going to word this thing so that it is not a still?

Do something “What is unknown about home?” Assess it out on the E-Meter. Find out what you get a bang on, you see?

“What is unknown about not being able to leave?” See? That’s right around on the back door, see? Not being able to leave home. Try to avoid the idea that he’s stuck in the house. “What is unknown about being stuck in the house?” Well, boy, you’re going to be stuck on that process from here on out, see? But sticking in the house won’t blow.

Remember that even while you’re running the problem, the theory of the prior confusion still operates, and unless you’ve got movement in the auditing phrases, you see, why, the thing is just going to stick. And you’re going to get onto an awful grind. And if you find yourself grinding sometime on a problem, and you keep running “What is unknown (blank, blank, blank) on this problem?” and you go on and on and on and on and nothing’s happening. Nothing is happening at all. And it just doesn’t seem to be flattening, and there seems to be some tone arm motion, but the thing just doesn’t seem to be flattening, and “What are we going to do? What are we going to do?”

I think you’d better go back and look at the phrasing of the problem that you have phrased for the pc, because it’s probably got a stick in it, and it’s probably doing exactly what it says. And you’ve probably phrased it something on the order, “What is unknown about Mother not moving?” See, that’s great! That’d run practically forever and get nowhere and wouldn’t blow. you see that?

It’s just the thing to do. If you find yourself running too long on the problem process or running too long on a rudiments problem process . . . which comes up all the time, not just in this Problems Intensive . . . and you find this thing isn’t flattening well, look over the thing to see if you’ve inadvertently included no motion in the auditing command. “What is unknown about your being stopped in life?” Oh, boy, that’d be great, you know? That’d just jam the bank, and it’d just keep going and going and going.

Oh, there is no expert, instant way unless you’ve got the pc right in front of you to transpose it over into a motion command. You get the pc to state it a couple of times, and hell generally give you a motion version of his problem. Take it quick before he changes his mind.

“How to keep from being stopped in life,” don’t you see, is not a no motion. See, it still implies action. See, he’s still preventing himself from being stopped. Well, the preventing himself from being stopped at least implies action. And that will barely run. You’re right on the dividing line there, you see? Right on the dividing line. How to keep from being stopped in life.

Well, it’s questionable, you know? But it’ll run. “What is unknown about being stopped in life?” Oh, no, no; that won’t run. “What is unknown about keeping from being stopped in life?” Oh, that’s very clumsy. And you can get a pc, however, phrasing it and . . . “Well, you know! How to keep going in life. That’s what I’m saying, you see?” he’ll explain to you. “How to keep going in life.”

You say, "Good. Well, then the auditing command, then, will be 'What is unknown about keeping going in life?' That's good. Here we go." And you'll find out it'll work out to the same process.

See, everything goes on the stop and the motion. So in putting these problems together, don't do an assessment, and make sure that you keep it in a motion category. And make sure that it's as close to the pc's problem as you can possibly get.

The best way, if it doesn't include the total stuck in it, is just to use the pc's statement of the problem or use the action verb of the pc's statement of the problem or the noun of the pc's problem.

"Well, how to get over being in France life after lifetime," you see? Maybe this is the problem, you know?

Well, you can avoid that very easily. "What is unknown about France?" See? That gets around the stick. You got the idea? He's got a lot of significance about this thing, but there must be something unknown about it, and you just use the subject matter of the thing and throw it in.

You'll find these problems will run. It requires no great anything, but you do have to know those two points.

Don't assess, and keep sticks out of the phrasing.

All right. Now, as you're running your assessment on the P form . . . "List persons present in the confusion" . . . you're going to be doing a Security Check on the assessed person. In other words, you're going to list all the people present and then you're going to do a Security Check on the person who falls the most . . . the most reaction rather. See? Everybody present in the confusion. What was the confusion immediately before that?

And he, "Oh, well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Well, who was present in that?"

"Well, there was Mama, and there was Grandpa, and there was Aunt Bessie, and there was Sister Kate, and uh... Oh, yes, and there was my father, yes. That's it."

You write all these things down, and that's it.

Now you assess this thing out and you find that you get quite a bang on Mother. All right. So you get the withholds from Mother at that time, and you pull these out in any Security Check fashion. And you get him security checked on the subject of Mama. You know, what had he done to her? What is he withholding for . . . about that thing And in that period what had he done? And all that sort of thing

And you finish up Mother.

And you come back again, and you say, "All right. Now, with regard to that confusion, was there anybody else present?"

And you nearly will always get the hidden person that is the source of the whole thing. In the hidden area . . . you see, you got the change. That was the only tag showing, and then you got the problem, and you ran that. And now you assess the person in the confusion which immediately preceded the problem, and just as the confusion was hidden and just as the problem was hidden, so there is a person hidden in that confusion. Ordinarily that person has gone.

So the only thing I want to tell you is add to line 6 . . . or section 6 of P . . . add to it. After you've done one Security Check on it, let's find out who else was there in that confusion. Let's find out who else was present. And you're going to get some jim-dandies dropping out of a hamper. They will appear suddenly and mysteriously and the pc has not thought of them for years.

All right. Now, one more thing There's no need to read the meter while listing O changes. Why would you read a meter on the list that you're going to assess anyway? So you just skip the meter while you're listing changes for O. Just skip it.

Now, don't do section O . . A to O in Model Session. It is simply done. you do not get any Model Session until you get to P, and you do Model S. P in Model Session complete. But no Model Session in A to O. and you don't remedy pc's havingness, and you don't do anything with the pc except pat him on the back and cheer him on. Okay?

Your Model Session starts with section P. Those are the basic things that have shaken out of the hamper. Those are the basic things which so far have shaken out of the hamper that auditors are having difficulty with doing this Problems Intensive.

It's not possible to have difficulties with but some people manage it.

All right. Now, the results coming through on this Problems Intensive are very, very, very, very, very good. They're excellent. They're hitting right on the button. And it's very nice. So if you're not hitting on any button when you do a Problems Intensive, you better call for Mama quick, in a hurry.

What you have done wrong? You have probably made a list of occurrences, have assessed the problem for some terminal that isn't the goals terminal of the pc and are running something else. And it doesn't have anything to do with the case or it's been a misassessment of some kind or another. There's . . a wild misassessment can keep you from getting a result with this Problems Intensive. You can do the assessment pretty bad. But I have seen a couple that were completely off, and boy, you talk about there was no problem, there was no prior confusion. There was nothing.

So a misassessment, you say, is never preceded by a problem.

Oh, here's the other test. The person . . I did have a test for it . . the person sits in present time and surmises what his problem must have been at that time if you have done the wrong assessment. They do that every time. They sit in present time and guess what their problem must have been during that period. If you have done an actual, prompt and proper assessment, if you have the actual changes and you've done an exact assessment and you're dead right, you ask them what the problem is, they could not fail to tell you; it just leaps out of their mouths.

So a test of whether or not you're on the right run is to say to the person . . just flatly . . you just say to the person, "Well, is this . . are you trying to figure out what your problem might have been during that period?"

And the person says, "Yes, I was trying to figure that out."

"Are you trying to figure out what the problems of a college boy would have been?"

"Ah-hah-hah. Well, that's what I'm doing"

And so you say, "Well, let's go back and assess this thing again." See, it's that abrupt an action as you'd take on it. Skip it. Because if you've got the right change and the right zone in his lifetime, you ask, "What is the problem?" you say pointedly, you see?

And he tells you, Boom! See? It's an "Oh, my God." Almost a "What do you know" reaction if you've got it right on the button, you see? And it's a "Well, I guess my problems during that period . . let's see, what would have been the problems of a young boy at that period? I guess getting dressed, and going to bed in the evening, and so forth, and so forth."

And you say, "Well, I'm going to assess again. Now we're going to . . ."

I actually go further than that. I'd look over the list. If I'd done the assessment, I'd know it was fairly right, and I'd know that he just hadn't mentioned a lot of changes in his lifetime. I'd do another O section. If I was getting something that crazy.

If it works, it works. And if it doesn't work, you haven't done a proper list of changes or an assessment. That's all.

Once more, just go back and do the whole thing again. I mean, go back to the beginning of O section, ask if there are any more changes in his lifetime that he himself determined. Find out if you haven't maybe added a lot of other-determined points in it. Correct the thing up as I've been giving you gen about in this thing.

Get it going again, and that time you'll hit it, Boom! Hell feel like he's been run into with a sledgehammer if you do it exactly right. A person couldn't have a lifetime without having one of these or he wouldn't be in bad shape. Do you get the idea?

So the person either has one of these or he's Clear. If you don't find it, you haven't done it right. Okay? It's one of these selfproving mechanisms. If there isn't a black cat in the middle of the room, there is no black cat in the middle of the room. It's very simple; very elementary. And if you've done it right, there's the damndest, biggest black cat in the middle of the room that you've ever heard of.

Okay. Well, I've chewed you out a good bit, and you realize now that there is one slight thing I will have to let you in on. That every day you don't pass one of the checksheet points on your checksheet, you owe an hour's auditing. Some of you would drown at that rate, so let's get going.

Thank you. Okay.